THE ADJUSTMENT MEASURES.

Certain "malcontents" are charging, that the Compromise bills of the last session are "bills of surrender." Mr. TOOMBS's able letter leaves them no ground to stand upon. Such men are neither true Whigs nor true Democrats. The leading men of the Democratic party justly abhor these malcontents. The Whigs disown them. They are enemies of their country, and in opposition to both parties. It is the duty of every patriot to oppose such men; and it is the duty of every good citizen to support the administration of President FILLMORE, now so furiously denounced by the abolitionists for his noble course, in relation to the Compromise acts of the last session. In his message to Congress, he said, in words that ought to be printed in gold:

"The series of measures to which I have alluded are regarded by me as a settlement, in principle and substance—a final settlement—of the dangerous and exciting subjects which they embraced." * * * * * * * * * *

"By that adjustment we have been rescued from the wide and boundless agitation that surrounded us, and have a firm, distinct, and legal ground to rest upon. And the occasion, I trust, will justify me IN EXHORTING MY COUNTRYMEN TO RALLY UPON AND MAINTAIN THAT GROUND as the best, if not the only means, of restoring peace and quiet to the country, and maintaining inviolate the integrity of the Union."

Let us look to our country first, and party afterwards. Let us give our grateful thanks to Clay and Cass, Foote and Webster, and other patriots of both parties, for their efforts to allay agitation, and restore harmony to the country; while we brand with public reprobation the malcontent disunionists—the Rhetts, and Giddingses, and the half-crazy satellites, playing the second fiddle to them, whether in the North or South.

In the language of Webster's noble letter to the Union meeting at Westchester, "The peace of the country requires this; the security of the Constitution requires this; and every consideration of the public good demands this."

From the Washington Republic, October 13th, 1850.

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT TOOMBS,

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

The position in which our State has been placed towards the General Government by the late proclamation of Governor Towns, makes it my duty to address you in relation to the recent legislation of Congress, to which resistance is proposed and advocated. I am opposed to such resistance, and invite your attention to my reasons for that opposition. My own action upon that legislation has been recklessly and virulently assailed, and systematically misrepresented by some of those who are opposed to it. I must, therefore, ask your indulgence for a brief exposition of that action, before proceeding to the statement of the measures referred to, the principles upon which they are based, and my answer to the objections urged against them. The policy of the last legislature upon the subject of our Federal relations has deeply endangered the honor, and perhaps the safety, of the State. The late proclamation of the Governor, professing to be in accordance with that policy, has placed our State in a defile where we can neither turn to the right hand nor to the left; where it is impossible to advance with safety and difficult to retreat with honor. In the present emergency, our true policy is to select one of two courses—we must either repudiate the action of the legislature and Governor Towns, or arm our people for resistance to the laws of the land and a dissolution of the Union. I am in favor of the first, and against the last alternative; *because I believe there is nothing in those laws which demands or would justify that resistance.* As I am not unfrequently quoted as authority in favor of such resistance, I will here restate my own position. When Congress met last December, I found there was a strong, and nearly unanimous, disposition on the part of the northern Whig members to interpolate the old Whig creed with Free-soil opinions. The same disposition strongly manifested itself also among the northern Democrats, though not to the same extent. Four years' experience in Congress had taught me the importance of the organization of the House to the success or defeat of public measures. After a free, full, and unsat-

GIDEON & Co., Printers.

isfactory conference in caucus with the northern Whigs, I determined not to co-operate with them in the election of Speaker, without some security upon the slavery question. I found them, with but few exceptions, pledged and determined to ingraft the Wilmot proviso upon territorial bills for the government of New Mexico and Utah, and to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. I therefore submitted to the caucus the following resolution, to wit:

"*Resolved*, That Congress ought to pass no law abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, or any law prohibiting it in the Territories of the United States."

The resolution was promptly rejected, and I, together with those who acted with me, as promptly withdrew from the caucus, and resisted, by all means in our power, the election of its nominee, Mr. Winthrop. The struggle for the Speakership resulted in the election of one of your own Representives, Mr. Cobb, whose able and efficient administration of its duties has been highly honorable to himself and beneficial to you. The contest for the organization of the House was marked by strong sectional feelings and angry and excited debates. In one of these debates, which attracted a good deal of public attention, I declared myself in favor of a dissolution of the Union if Congress applied the proviso to the Territories, or abolished slavery in the District of Columbia, or refused efficient legislation for the recovery of fugitive slaves. In March I received, through Governor Towns, the resolutions passed by the legislature of Georgia, declaring it to be the duty of the people to resist the Federal Government upon the three grounds just mentioned, and also for the additional one of the admission of California into the Union as a State. I immediately replied to these resolutions, adhered to my own grounds of resistance, and refused to sanction the additional ground assumed by the legislature, and declared my determination to oppose any resistance by the State on account of the admission of California. On the 27th of February, I delivered a speech in the House of Representatives, in which the relation of the Federal Government to slavery, and especially to slavery in the Territories, was carefully and elaborately examined, and in that speech I distinctly laid down the principle that "The first act of *legislative hostility* is the proper point of southern resistance." I urged the South "to stand by the Constitution and the laws, to observe in good faith all of their requirements until the wrong is consummated, until the *act of exclusion is put upon the statute books.*" I held that while non-intervention was not the measure of our rights, "hostile legislation was the point of resistance;" and maintained that, whenever this principle was violated, it was "not only the right but the duty of the slaveholding States to resume the powers which they have conferred upon this Government, and to seek new safeguards for their future security." These are the principles upon which I acted throughout the session. Garbled extracts from some speeches I made in support of them; distorted, interpolated, inaccurate extracts from others, have been fraudulently applied to bolster up causes for resistance which I openly repudiated, and to convict me of inconsistency. The past is safe—there stands the record. In the Whig caucus at the opening of Congress, in my speech in December, in my speech in February, in my letter to Governor Towns in March, I affirmed my own grounds of resistance to the Government, of disunion, to be these three: 1st. The abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. 2d. The *prohibition* of slavery by Congress in the Territories. 3d. The refusal of a fair measure for the delivery of fugitive slaves. I took no other; I advocated no other grounds of resistance; I did not abandon or compromise one jot or tittle of them; I did not enlarge them to include the errors and follies of southern men, or diminish them to conciliate the hostility of northern men; I stood by them, and they are not violated by the legislation which I am about to review. The fugitive slave bill, which I demanded, was granted; it was satisfactory to the whole South, and received the votes of every one of the members in both Houses of Congress. The abolition of slavery in the District, and the prohibition of it in the Territories—the two other measures which I stood pledged to resist—were defeated, crushed, and abandoned. A series of measures for the pacification of our territorial difficulties was adopted, the basis of which I proposed as early as February, and was ready at any time during the whole Congress to accept; yet I am reproached for not giving "aid and comfort" to a factious, foolish, and untenable resistance to the Government for legislation which I have uniformly held and publicly declared to be neither a just nor sufficient cause for such resistance. I have refused first, last, and all the time, to endorse this California rebellion; it has no claims upon me; I am and have ever been its enemy, and shall give it nothing but the rights of war.

Congress passed four bills in relation to territory acquired from Mexico—a bill to admit California into the Union; a bill to settle the boundary between Texas and New Mexico; and bills establishing territorial governments both for New Mexico and Utah. By them, in my opinion, the Government has not performed its whole duty to us; by them the South may not have secured all of her just rights; but *she has firmly established great and important principles, and she has compromised no right, surrendered no principle, lost not an inch of ground in this great contest.* She stands as free and untrammelled to assert any just right in relation to the common territories, as she did before the bills for the establishment of governments over them were passed—with the advantage at least of having recovered the principle unwisely surrendered in 1820. The defeat of these bills would have lost that advantage, and would in no respect have left any right of the South on any better footing than that upon which it now stands. The memorable controversy between the North and the South in 1819 and 1820, although it resulted in the exercise of the power to prohibit slavery in a portion of the Territories of the United States, did not originate in a question of territorial government. Missouri presented to Congress a consti-

tution sanctioning slavery; the North asserted the power not only to prohibit slavery in the Territories, but to plant a perpetual population of it in the constitution of a State regularly asking admission into the Union. The South opposed the restriction and based her opposition to it upon the true constitutional grounds—that Congress had no other control over the constitution of a State seeking admission into the Union, than to see that its constitution shall establish for it a republican form of government. The struggle was violent and protracted; the Republic was shaken to its foundations; and wise, and good, and patriotic men believed its hour of dissolution had come. In an evil hour the South bought this clear, plain, and palpable constitutional right for Missouri, only at a great price, a price that ought not to have been paid, a price worth more to her than the Union. Instead of striking from the limbs of her young sister, with the sword, the fetters which the North sought unjustly to impose upon them, the South ransomed her by allowing slavery to be prohibited in all that part of the Louisiana territory lying north of the parallel of 36° 30′ north latitude, and west of Missouri. This *great principle, thus compromised away in* 1820, *has been rescued, re-established, and again firmly planted in our political system by the recent action of Congress.* It is provided in the territorial bills, both for New Mexico and Utah, that each of these Territories, when proposed for admission into the Union, shall come into the Union with or without slavery, as the people inhabiting them may determine for themselves. Both of these Territories extend north to the 42° parallel of north latitude, and thus the Missouri line is carried up to that point, and five and a half degrees of latitude is recovered from the prohibition of slavery, which the application of the Missouri compromise would have imposed upon it.

The Texas boundary question was complicated and full of difficulties; she claimed a vast territory, much of which no Texan ever explored, extending up to the 42d parallel of north latitude. Her title was purely technical. She had never conquered it, nor bought it, nor possessed it. She had not acquired it by any of the ordinary modes of acquiring property or dominion over people or countries. She made herself a title by act of her own legislature; our Government acquiesced in it, maintained it by the sword, and finally became estopped from disputing its validity. Much of it was inhabited by an ignorant, imbecile, half-civilized, mixed race, hostile to and despised by the Texans. These people claimed to be entitled to protection against the rights of Texas under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The pretension, in my judgment, was ill-founded, but it had numerous formidable and zealous supporters. Under this state of facts the boundary bill was introduced and passed, by which Texas was offered ten millions of dollars for a cession to the United States of her right to the soil, and jurisdiction of a considerable portion of this country. If Texas accepts it, as I hope she will, the contract will be complete, and a difficult and dangerous question will have been honorably adjusted. This *measure, so proper in itself, so generous to Texas, so necessary to the peace of the country, is violently assailed by the malcontents, under the pretext that it surrenders a vast number of acres of* slave territory to free soil. *The complaint is without the least foundation.* It includes the admission that the country ceded belongs to Texas, and is now slave territory. I grant it; but how does inclusion in the limits of the territory of New Mexico make it free soil?

The grant is not accompanied by any prohibition of slavery, and there is no such prohibition in the bill for the territorial government of New Mexico. The Mexican laws against slavery cannot affect it if it belongs to Texas, but the Texas laws in favor of slavery can, and do fix its character, and the transfer to the United States will not alter it. But so far from the objection being well founded, the South is the actual gainer by the transfer. By one of the resolutions annexing Texas to the United States, it is stipulated that Texas may be divided into States, and it is expressly provided that slavery shall be forever prohibited in such State as may be formed out of that part of Texas lying north of 36° 30′. But by ceding that part of Texas to New Mexico, it is placed under the law of that Territory, which, as I have before shown, permits it to come into the Union with or without slavery, as the people may determine; thus the prohibition of slavery imposed by the compact of annexation is removed, and the Wilmot proviso, for the first time in the history of our Government, is actually repealed. The South has, therefore, not only recovered the great principle compromised away in 1820, but she has placed under its just operation a tract of country nearly as large as South Carolina, in which slavery was forever prohibited by the compact of Texan annexation. I do not say that slavery will ever go there, but I do assert that all legal impediments, both to its entry and continuance there, are removed, a great principle is sustained, and truth is vindicated by the measure complained of.

Another important consequence springs out of this annexation of a part of Texas to the Territory of New Mexico; slavery is established by the municipal laws of Texas; the country ceded by her retains this municipal law; it contains nearly the whole of the civilized inhabitants of the Territory. In that large portion of California which is now embraced within the limits of the territorial government of New Mexico, it is believed there does not reside a single civilized man of any nation or colony; the extensive valley of the Colorado, which is supposed to be the most valuable for agricultural purposes of all the country acquired from Mexico, has not even been explored; there never was any organized Mexican government established over it; therefore, admitting the Mexican law against slavery to obtain *de jure*, in that extensive country, a different law prevails in the civilized portions ceded by Texas. The two different laws upon the same subject cannot exist in the same territory of the United States. In this conflict of laws the law of the civilized must prevail over the law of the savage portion of the inhabitants; hence

the municipal law of Mexico, existing at the time of the conquest over that portion of the country occupied by savages, must give way to the municipal laws of Texas, existing, at the time of the cession, over the civilized portion. Besides, the Constitution and laws of the United States, not totally inapplicable, are extended over the whole territory, and there is a section in the New Mexican Territorial bill declaring that no citizen of the United States in said Territory shall be deprived of his life, his liberty, or his property, except by the judgment of his peers and the laws of the land.

These are the main features in the territorial bills having any relation to slavery. Utah is inhabited by that singular and remarkable people called Mormons; the form of government presented by them to Congress was silent upon the subject of African slavery, but it is understood that it already exists among them, and is protected by their laws. Under this state of facts, and because these provisions were in the territorial bills, and because prohibitory provisions were not in them, I voted for them. They may remove all legal impediments to the introduction and enjoyment of slave property in the Territories. I believe such will be the effect of the bills in the Territory of New Mexico, which embraces a much greater portion of the acquisition, both in extent and value, than lies south of 36 deg. 30 min., and therefore, taken alone, is a better division for us than the Missouri Compromise line. It will be the effect in both New Mexico and Utah, if there be one particle of truth in the constitutional opinions of those who have for two years made war on me for demanding legislation, and who have heretofore denied, and still deny, the existence and validity of any Mexican law against slavery. Even though such may be the effect of these bills, I preferred a direct repeal of the Mexican law, and direct legislation for the protection and safety of slave property in the Territories, and voted for, and endeavored to obtain, such legislation. I preferred it because it would have been an open, direct, and practical assertion of our right to legal protection, and the duty of the Federal Government to give that protection to our slave property wherever its jurisdiction was exclusive and paramount. It would have removed all doubts and quieted all fears upon the subject. It would have condemned and repudiated that political heresy called non-intervention, where adoption by the South will forever settle the question of slavery extension against her, and will finally achieve the bloody exodus of slavery itself from its present limits.

Some well-meaning and patriotic men tell us to cling to non-intervention as our only safety, because, if we concede the power to Congress to legislate for our protection, it will legislate for the destruction of our property. If this be true, those who are now for secession are right, and ought to secede. We are invited to commit the gigantic folly of discharging our Government from the duty of protecting us in the enjoyment of our property, which was the main object of its creation, and render our system almost the only one for its continuance, because, unless we do, it will destroy it. I have never heard a better reason given for a revolution in any age or country. It admits that the Government is incapable of discharging the first and highest duty of every political system. This admitted incapacity of the Government to discharge the duty of protection to the citizen, if true, abrogates the obligation of allegiance, and makes revolution a duty. But I hold that this assumption is not yet proven, and we should continue to admit the right to legislate for our protection, and to demand its exercise whenever and wherever necessary, until it shall be used against us; then it will be time to protect ourselves. We, together with the rest of the people of the United States, pay at least thirty millions for the protection of the property of the people; we spend ten millions per annum for a navy to watch and protect it from every danger in every sea; we spend near ten millions more for an army to be used for the same purpose; we spend other ten millions in sending ministers and commercial agents all over the world, and in other incidental charges incurred for its security and protection; yet we are told that, of all the items of material wealth owned and possessed by our people, slaves alone—which are greater in value than all the rest besides that we possess—shall be put out of the protection of the laws, and under the law of the Republic. The reason given for this is as fanciful and absurd as the position is unsound.

It is said to be because it is a "*peculiar*" institution. The framers of the Constitution drew a different conclusion from this quality. It was liable, from its character, to peculiar dangers, and therefore they surrounded it with peculiar safeguards. Because slaves were liable to run away into free States, the Constitution required them to be delivered up to the owner, and Congress has legislated to carry out that provision. Because it was liable to the danger of insurrection, the Constitution provided for the suppression of insurrection, and Congress has already legislated appropriately to call upon every citizen of the United States, liable to bear arms, to repel this danger. Having provided, then, special and appropriate safeguards against these peculiar dangers in all other respects, the Constitution left it precisely upon the same footing as all other property in or out of the States; and the want of power in Congress to legislate against it, even in the States, does not arise from any peculiarity in slave property; it is equally true of all other property; horses and bales of goods are as much exempt from such hostile legislation as slaves, and their exemption is based on the same principle. Therefore non-intervention is no more a correct principle, as applied to slavery, than to any other species of property, and is wholly untenable and destructive to the rights of all property. But it is said that non-intervention has already been the doctrine and policy of the South. This idea results from a total misconception of our past history.

In all our former acquisitions, except Oregon, slavery was expressly prohibited by law when

we acquired them; therefore we have no need of any legislation to secure our equal enjoyment of them; we had only to resist hostile legislation to secure our rights. In Oregon there was no law upon the subject; we resisted unavailingly hostile legislation, and were excluded. The acquisition from Mexico presented the first case where there was a law against slavery, upon which the direct question arose of the power and duty of Congress to repeal it. The doctrine, as now applied, is but two years old. General Cass, in the Presidential canvass of 1848, finding himself embarrassed by the conflicting opinions and feelings of the country upon the question, seized upon non-intervention as a life-boat in the political storm of a Presidential canvass. It is worthy of remark, that he held that legislation was necessary to our entry and enjoyment of our property in the country; that the laws of Mexico excluded us, but denied the power of Congress to remove them; his southern friends took as much of the heresy as they could carry, and held that if there were any such laws they were void under our Constitution, and united with General Cass in denying the power to remove them. Its friends must therefore restrict "always" to two years. This was the beginning, and I hope it will be the end, of this dangerous heresy; except by some half dozen southern men, it was unanimously repudiated by the whole South in both branches of Congress during the late session. Its next appearance will be from the North. We had as well cling to a mill-stone about our necks for safety, amid the boundless waste of bottomless waters, as to this doctrine of non-intervention for an anchor of safety to our slave property. This doctrine of non-intervention deprived us of all hope of procuring a direct repeal of the Mexican laws. In other respects these territorial bills were not only unobjectionable, but highly desirable to me; *they demanded no concession from the South, violated no principle, and left us untrammelled for the future;* upon my own principles, by them, Congress was discharging a large measure of its duty, but not its whole duty. The question presented to me on their passage was, whether I should accept them, when, upon my principles, they seemed a large portion at least of your rights, and according to the opinion of a majority of the South, secure them all, or reject them. The question was a plain one to me. I did not hesitate, but gave them ready and active support. The objections to my course in this respect are not only extraordinary in themselves, but still more so from the quarter whence they came. The objections belong exclusively, as far as I know them, to that class who have uniformly supported non-intervention, and who, for the last two years, have wasted scores of ink in attempting to demonstrate my "unsoundness on the slavery question," for maintaining the right and duty of Congress to legislate for our protection in the Territories. They have abandoned their errors but not their objects; being intent upon the ruin of the Republic, they use truth or error for its accomplishment, as may best suit the exigencies of the hour. If these neophytes are honest in their conversion, they may find abundant consolation in the fact, that the principle is neither conceded, compromitted, nor endangered by these bills. It is strengthened, not weakened, by them, and will survive their present zeal and future apostacy.

The admission of California into the Union seems to be the master grievance of the day. The last legislature of Georgia, according to Gov. Towns, declared it sufficient cause for resistance to the Federal Government. I do not concur in this opinion, and sought an early occasion, after its announcement by the legislature to explain my dissent from it in the letter to Gov. Towns, to which I have before referred. My opinion has undergone no change, and I am ready to redeem the pledge then given, to oppose resistance of any sort to the Government for that cause. Under the express power to admit new States, the admission of California was purely a question of Congressional discretion. The law admitting her is a constitutional law, passed according to the prescribed forms, and by virtue of the power vested in Congress by the Constitution. It may be wise or unwise, but it is a constitutional law. It inflicts no sectional wrong or injury on the South, and, in my opinion, ought not to be resisted by the South. In the exercise of my discretion, as your representative, I voted against the bill. My principal reasons were, 1st. There had been no act of Congress authorizing the people inhabiting that Territory to form a constitution and erect a State government. This has been the usual, but not the universal, rule; and, while admitting the right of Congress to depart from it, I adhered to it, because I believed it to be safest and best that so important an act as this should rest on law, and be conducted according to law. 2dly. The title to nearly all the land of the country was still in the Government. No provision having been made for the primary disposition of the soil, a very large proportion of the population were in law intruders on the public lands, with no fixed habitations, and were placed by these unfortunate circumstances in a very unfavorable condition for the maintenance of social order and good government. 3d. The boundaries declared by California for herself were injudiciously large, including remote and disconnected settlements, separated by formidable natural barriers, and perhaps not less in some cases by dissimilarity of pursuits, wants, and interests. None of these reasons are sectional, and would as well warrant Massachusetts in resisting the law as Georgia. Congress waived these objections, and had a right to waive them; and it is not to be denied that there were weighty reasons on the other side for her admission. She had a population of American citizens much beyond the number requisite for her admission. Her people, without any fault of theirs, but on account of our disagreements on the slavery question, had been without lawful government for several years. They were subjected to an illegal and unconstitutional military usurpation at the very moment when they most needed stable, and regular, and lawful government. They had an undoubted right to throw off that government, and were righfully entitled to a government of laws instead of military force.

The remoteness of California, the extraordinary state of things existing there, resulting from the unprecedented discoveries of gold, and the high rate of wages, made its government by Congress not only inconvenient and difficult, but enormously expensive to us. The mixed character of the population from all countries, inviting collision and hostility, augmented the necessity for efficient and regular government. In weighing these reasons, Congress decided for her admission, and I doubt not that the exclusion of slavery by her constitution had a great and perhaps controlling influence in favor of her admission with the northern members. But they did not transcend their powers. It is equally due to truth and candor to say, that the controlling reason for resistance to that act at the South is founded upon that same clause in her constitution excluding slavery. That reason ought not to have controlled either party, and especially is not a just or sufficient reason for opposing the law and resisting the Government. I have already attempted to vindicate the rights of a people, forming a constitution for admission into the Union, to admit or exclude slavery at their own pleasure, and to prove that Congress had no other power over such constitution thus presented than to see that it is republican. We demanded it and compromised it for Missouri. We have demanded it and secured it for New Mexico and Utah. We should adhere to it, because it is right; but it is expedient as well as right. One hundred and fifty thousand American citizens, on the distant shores of the Pacific ocean, having met, by their representatives, to form a constitution for themselves, have adjudged it best, under their peculiar circumstances, for their interest, their prosperity, and their happiness, to prohibit the introduction of slavery into their new commonwealth. It is their business, not ours. Whether they have decided wisely or unwisely, it is not for us to determine. We have settled the question differently for ourselves; it is not for them to disturb that judgment now or hereafter; *both cases stand upon the same great principle—the right of a free people, in entering the family of American States, to adopt such a form of republican government as in their judgment will best preserve their liberties, promote their happiness, and perpetuate their prosperity.* If we are wise we will defend rather than resist this birthright of American freemen, so invaluable to us, so formidable to the enemies of our property, our peace, and our safety. I am ready to rally with you for the defence of this great principle. With no memory for past differences of opinion, careless of the future, I am ready to unite with any portion, or all, of my countrymen in defence of the integrity of the Republic.

I am, very respectfully, your obliged fellow-citizen,

R. TOOMBS.

In the debate in the House of Representatives, September 7th, 1850, Mr. Toombs, in reply to remarks relative to outrages on the South, expressed his desire to say a word in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Seddon.) The objection that the gentleman urged to the bill seemed to be, that there had been a series of outrages perpetrated upon the South. If the passage of the territorial bills without restriction on the subject of slavery is not an outrage, and the gentleman does not seem to suppose that it is, then there has been none committed. And I have this to say to the gentleman, if there have been aggressions perpetrated upon the South, she has done the mischief herself, she has only herself to blame. It is by her own hands, and by the hands of her sons, that the wrong has been done.

The gentleman from Virginia had spoken of outrages committed on the South. There could certainly be no outrage connected with this legislation. So far as that was concerned, it was perfectly satisfactory. The gentleman was not justified in saying that an outrage was committed upon the South. If any outrage had been committed upon her, it had been done by her own sons. If the matter were tested, this would be found to be the case.

Again—

The gentleman's objection seemed to be, that there were other measures forced upon the South which were objectionable. He denied that any such measures were forced upon the South. Nearly two-thirds of the whole Southern delegation had voted for all the measures which referred particularly to Southern interests, whilst a majority of the Northern votes had been cast against them.

As to the bill for the admission of California—for the gentleman had particularly referred to that—he believed it was no outrage upon the South; he never had believed that it was an outrage upon the South. Attempts were made for eight months to force this point upon him, but he avoided an issue on that. [Applause.] His position was well known. So far as the Texas Boundary bill was concerned, he believed it to be a wise and just measure. He had never had any objection to it; he believed that it was advantageous to Texas and advantageous to this Republic.

In regard to California he would say, that he believed the best policy of the North would have been to divide her territory; he believed that before five years elapsed it would be divided. The North, by its division, would have two free States instead of one. These were his deliberate opinions, and he had proclaimed them everywhere. He had yielded to concession and the will of the people, North, East, South, and West; and the gentleman could take the concession for what he could make out of it.

The following table is extracted from a list of the votes by States, published in the "Union" newspaper in September, 1850, and in the "Republic," September 9th, 1850.

"TEXAS BOUNDARY AND NEW MEXICO BILL."

Votes of members from Slaveholding States.

DELAWARE.

Whig.—Yea: Mr. Houston.

MARYLAND.

Democrats.—Yeas: Messrs. Hammond and McLane.
Whigs.—Yeas: Messrs. Bowie and Kerr.

VIRGINIA.

Democrats.—Yeas: Messrs. Bayly, Beale, Edmondson, McDowell, McMullen, and Parker. Nays: Messrs. Averett, Holladay, Meade, Millson, Powell, and Seddon.
Whigs.—Yeas: Messrs. Haymond and Morton.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Democrats.—Nays: Messrs. Ashe, Daniel, and Venable.
Whigs.—Yeas: Messrs. Caldwell, Deberry, Outlaw, Shepperd, and Stanly. Nay: Mr. Clingman.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Democrats.—Nays: Messrs. Burt, Colcock, Holmes, McQueen, Orr, Wallace, and Woodward.

GEORGIA.

Democrats.—Yea: Mr. Wellborn. Nays: Messrs. Haralson and Jackson.
Whigs.—Yeas: Messrs. Owen and Toombs.

FLORIDA.

Whig.—Yea: Mr. Cabell.

ALABAMA.

Democrats.—Yea: Mr. Cobb. Nays: Messrs. Bowdon, Harris, Hubbard, and Inge.
Whigs.—Yeas: Messrs. Alston and Hilliard.

MISSOURI.

Democrats.—Yeas: Messrs. Bowlin, Bay, Green, and Hall. Nay: Mr. Phelps.

KENTUCKY.

Democrats.—Yeas: Messrs. Boyd, Caldwell, Mason, and Stanton.
Whigs.—Yeas: Messrs. Breck, Johnson, Marshal, McLane, and Morehead.

TENNESSEE.

Democrats.—Yeas: Messrs. Ewing, Harris, Johnson, Jones, Stanton, and Thomas.
Whigs.—Yeas: Messrs. Anderson, Gentry, Watkins, and Williams.

MISSISSIPPI.

Democrats.—Nays: Messrs. Brown, Featherston, McWillie, and Thompson.

ARKANSAS.

Democrat.—Nay: Mr. Johnson.

LOUISIANA.

Democrats.—Nays: Messrs. La Sēre and Morse.

TEXAS.

Democrats.—Yeas: Messrs. Howard and Kaufman.

(Evans of Maryland, (*Whig,*) and Hamilton, (*Democrat,*) absent, but in favor of the bill.)

SUMMARY.

	Yeas.	Nays.
Democrats from Slaveholding States	27	29
Whigs from Slaveholding States	25	1
	52	30

Speaker COBB not voting, but favorable to the bill.

Now, if the interests of the South have been surrendered, has not the South done it?

Besides those *opposed* to the bill, whose names appear in this list, were the Free Soilers and Abolitionists—Allen and Mann of Massachusetts, Preston King of New York, Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania, Giddings and Root of Ohio, and Julian of Indiana, good company for Seddon and Meade of Virginia, Clingman of North Carolina, and the South Carolina disunionists. Now, when it is remembered that Clay of Kentucky, Pierce of Maryland, Badger and Mangum of North Carolina, Bell of Tennessee, Berrien and Dawson of Georgia, Foot of Mississippi, Downs of Louisiana, and others supported these bills, how ridiculous is the charge that these Compromise measures surrendered the rights of the South.

In addition to all this, let us add the illustrious name of Webster—the special object of attack from the Abolitionists—and of the members of the Cabinet, Stuart, Graham, Conrad, and Crittenden—all in favor of these Compromise bills. How crazy or wicked must that malcontent be, who would charge these men with surrendering the rights of the South?

It is well known that the Abolitionists in Congress, and through their newspapers, denounce these Compromise measures as "surrendering" every thing to the South.

The man in the jury box, who complained that he had eleven most obstinate men to deal with, would appear a reasonable man in comparison with one who complains of these measures as doing injustice to the South. Such a malcontent bears more resemblance to the madman in confinement who, when asked why he was deprived of his liberty, answered, that he "thought the world was mad, and the world thought he was mad, and the world being in the majority had put him in prison."